

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action mailed January 11, 2006. Applicants have amended claims 11-12, 15-17 and 21-22. Applicants have also added new dependent claims 25-27. Claims 11-22 and 25-27, as amended, are now presented for consideration in view of the remarks below.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the above-identified application, and in light of the above amendments and remarks that follow are respectfully requested. Because the present claims are believed to be in condition for immediate allowance over the newly-cited combination of prior art, it is submitted that good and sufficient cause exists for the entry for this amendment in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.116.

In the Official Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 11-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,292,618 to Ohara et al. ("Ohara") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,385 to Young et al. ("Young '385") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,624 to Saib et al. ("Saib").

With respect to Ohara, the Examiner admits that Ohara fails to explicitly disclose a digital interface as well as "the on-screen display processor being adapted to generate . . . external storage device" as previously provided in claim 11. In an effort to remedy the deficiencies of Ohara, the Examiner relies upon Saib for teaching a digital interface and upon Young '385 for teaching the remaining limitations of claim 11.

In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicants maintain that the Examiner's rejection of the claims based on Ohara, Saib and Young '385 are no longer warranted as the combination of these references, even if properly combinable, would not produce the presently claimed invention of the present claims.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to more clearly delineate the differences between the present invention and that of the prior art. By way of background information, Applicants would remind the Examiner that the presently claimed invention generates on-screen displays for two different situations. The first situation is on-screen displays associated with digital television signals currently being received. The second situation is on-screen displays being generated for a program that is being reproduced from an external storage device. When a program is currently being received, a first pair of "received" on-screen display screens can be shown, such as those shown in Figure 2, whereas when recorded programming is being reproduced and transmitted from an external storage device, a second pair of "reproduced" on-screen displays can be shown, such as shown in Figure 5.

The received program explanation screen, as well as the reproduced program explanation screen, both include at least one of the title of the program, the start and end time and one or more program selection options (e.g., picture angle, program language and translation data), as can be seen for instance in Figures 2 and 5. Further, the reproduced program explanation screen and the reproduced contents display screen each include at least one additional indicia element (such as an "under reproduction" closed indicia element) indicating that the program being viewed is being reproduced from the external storage device as opposed to the program from the currently received broadcast television programming. In this manner, user confusion is avoided as to whether the program explanation screen or contents display screen is being generated for the currently received television program or for the program being reproduced from an external storage device.

Moreover, information that is not relevant to possible user selections in connection with the reproduced contents

display screen can be omitted, such as for example the charge amount and age limit, as shown in Figure 2 but not shown in Figure 5, in connection with the contents display screen.

The prior art being applied by the Examiner does not disclose, teach or suggest the provision of at least one of a title of program, start/end time and program selection option (e.g., one or more of picture angle, program language and translation data selections) by the viewer for both the received program explanation screen and the reproduced program explanation screen. Nor does the prior art, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest the reproduced program explanation screen and the reproduced contents display screen each including one or more indicia elements indicating that the program being viewed is being reproduced from the external storage device as opposed to a program currently being received from the broadcast television programming.

Further, the prior art does not teach, suggest or disclose initially using the visually identical program explanation screens for both the received and reproduced pictures, but allowing for at least one additional indicia element on one of the screens to allow the viewer to distinguish between the source of the program. For instance, for this feature, the Examiner cites to Young '385, Figures 12 and 13 (Official Action, page 6). However, Young's Figures 12 and 13 are not visually identical in layout on the screen but for at least one or more indicia elements to allow the viewer to distinguish between the program explanation screens. In other words, the layout of the screen of Figure 12 and the layout of the screen of Figure 13 in Young '385 are not the visually the same.

Therefore, it is submitted that the presently claimed invention would not have been obvious in view of the proposed combination of prior art.


In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone Applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jonathan A. David
Registration No.: 36,494
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicants

634420_1.DOC